

REMARKS

Claims 1-18 are pending in the application and the same are rejected. By this Amendment, claims 2, 3, 8, 9, 14, and 15 are canceled and claims 1, 7, and 13 are amended. Accordingly, claims 1, 4-7, 10-13, and 16-18 remain in the application and are presented for review and further consideration by the Examiner.

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 7, and 13 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,606,163, in view of Hidaka et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,782,402. (Examiner's Action, page 2, ¶ 2).

In response, Applicant has amended claim 1, 7, and 13 to include limitations of dependent claims 2, 8, and 14, respectively.

The Examiner has rejected claims 2, 8, and 14 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Hidaka and further in view of Feuerstein et al., U.S. Published Application 2002/0083341. (Examiner's Action, page 3, ¶ 4).

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

That Examiner notes that Suzuki does not disclose the elements of claims 2, 8, and 14. Furthermore, Hidaka does not even mention file extensions.

Feuerstein discloses a security component for a computing device. The security component has a request validation component 416. The request validation component 416 evaluates each file extension of a resource identifier contained within a resource request and will allow only resource requests with the following file extensions to process: asp, .css, .inc, .hdr, .ofx, jpg, jpeg, .bmp, gif, .htm, .html, dll, .ico, and .txt. The request validation component 416 verifies that a file extension in a resource request is valid by comparing the file extension with a list of valid file extensions 420.

Feuerstein does not disclose comparing the extension of the file to a list of print ready extensions. Nor does Feuerstein disclose, responsive to a match between the extension of the file and a print ready extension, realizing the file

type is print ready. Not only does Feuerstein not disclose these limitations, but these limitations are not even suggested by Feuerstein, since Feuerstein is concerned with security rather than a file's readiness for printing.

In contrast, Applicant's independent claims 1, 7, and 13, as amended to include the limitations of claims 2, 8, and 14, respectively, include wording that the name of the file includes an extension and discovering the file type includes comparing the extension of the file to a list of print ready extensions and, responsive to a match between the extension of the file and a print ready extension, realizing the file type is print ready. Neither Feuerstein, Suzuki, nor Hidaka discloses these limitations.

The Examiner has rejected claims 3, 9, and 15 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Hidaka and further in view of Roberts, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,650,431. (Examiner's Action, page 4, ¶ 5).

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner has rejected claims 4, 5, 10, 11, 16, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Hidaka and further in view of Crandall, et al., U.S. Patent No. 5,963,641. (Examiner's Action, page 5, ¶ 6).

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

The Examiner has rejected claims 6, 12, and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Suzuki in view of Hidaka and further in view of Koppolu, et al., U.S. Patent No. 6,268,924. (Examiner's Action, page 6, ¶ 7).

Applicant respectfully disagrees.

In view of Applicant's arguments and amendments with respect to independent claims 1, 7, and 13 being allowable, Applicant respectfully submits that the remaining dependent claims are also allowable because they contain all

of the limitations of their respective independent claims and further add structural and functional limitations. Furthermore, Applicant finds nothing in Feuerstein, Roberts, Crandall, or Koppolu that cures the noted deficiencies of Suzuki and Hidaka, and claims 1, 7, and 13 are therefore allowable in view of all of these references.

The foregoing amendments and arguments are believed to be a complete response to the most recent Examiner's Action.

No new matter has been added.

It is respectfully submitted that there is no claim, teaching, motivation, or suggestion in any of the prior art cited, alone or in combination, to produce what Applicant claims.

It is further submitted that the application, as amended, defines patentable subject matter and that the claims are in a condition for allowance. Such allowance at an early date is respectfully requested.

Should any issues remain which would preclude the prompt disposition of this case, it is requested that the Examiner contact the undersigned practitioner by telephone.

Respectfully submitted,
James S. Boyce

By 
Mark G. Pannell
Reg. No. 40,761

Date 01/18/2006
(719) 260-7900